

REMARKS**I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 43-46, 56 and 57 are all the claims currently pending.

By this Amendment, claims 43, 56 and 57 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 43, 45, 46, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamada (U.S. Patent No. 5,521,719, hereafter Yamada). Additionally, Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,767,985, hereafter Yamamoto). Accordingly, the Applicant has herein amended claims 43, 56 and 57 to further distinguish the present invention from the prior art of record and to expedite prosecution of the application.

By the above amendments, claims 43, 56 and 57 are directed to a feature wherein a telephone number of a transmitting source and a reception date of facsimile image data received by a facsimile reception means, are recognized. The recognized telephone number and reception date are then transmitted with e-mail data converted from the facsimile image data. Accordingly, it is possible for a receiving side to easily identify the transmitting source from which the facsimile image data is received because of the telephone number and reception date. This feature is supported by the "Fax Reception Date" and the "Fax Source Telephone Number" of the e-mail data illustrated in Fig. 5; and especially by the "Source Telephone Number 4-25" and the "Call Reception Date 4-24" illustrated in Fig. 4.

Yamada, on the other hand, gives no hint or suggestion to transmit e-mail data converted from the received facsimile image data along with a telephone number and a reception date. Moreover, Yamamoto does not appear to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Yamada to render obvious any claims of the present invention. Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of Yamada and Yamamoto, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in claims 43, 56 and 57. Therefore, claims 43, 56 and 57 are believed to be distinguishable over Yamada and Yamamoto, either individually or in combination. Likewise, claims 44-46 are also believed to be distinguishable over Yamada and Yamamoto based on their dependency on claim 43.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4458.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4458.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: _____

1/10/05

By: _____

Mark D. Pratt
Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101